

December 3, 1990

Mr. Robert Swale
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
230 South Dearborn Street
Mail Code 5HS-11
Chicago, IL 60604

RE: Transmittal of Technical Memorandum No. 1
Feasibility Study Report
ACS NPL Site
Griffith, Indiana

Dear Mr. Swale:

Enclosed for your review are five copies of Technical Memorandum Number 1: Identification and Screening of Technologies for the ACS NPL Site in Griffith, Indiana. This submittal is made pursuant to section 5.1.4 of the Work Plan for the site dated April 8, 1988. According to the Work Plan, approval of the Technical Memorandum is required before proceeding to the next task, which is remedial alternative screening. It is our understanding that your informal review of this Technical Memorandum during our meeting on November 29, 1990 serves as approval to proceed. Therefore, Warzyn is immediately proceeding with the remedial alternative screening process. If our understanding on this matter is not correct, please notify us immediately so that we can suspend work on the Feasibility Study until formal review and approval is obtained from U.S. EPA.

As we discussed in the meeting among U.S. EPA, Roy F. Weston, and Warzyn on November 7, 1990, the Feasibility Study Report will follow the format for the Wayne Reclamation and Recycling site in Columbia City, Indiana. This format was chosen because it is a Feasibility Study recently accepted by both U.S. EPA and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM). The Feasibility Study Report will be prepared in five sections. These sections are:

Section 1. Introduction - This will be a brief summary of the history of the site, and the results of the Remedial Investigation Report. This section will be submitted with the Draft Feasibility Study Report. This section will include language from the Remedial Investigation Report that has been accepted by U.S. EPA.

Section 2. Identification and Screening of Technologies - This section will describe the remedial action technologies that are appropriate at the site. An initial screening of the technologies will be conducted and the technologies which pass the screening will be assembled into potential remedial alternatives. It is anticipated that 10 to 12 alternatives will be identified for consideration.

Section 3. Development and Screening of Alternatives - This section will present a description of each of the remedial action alternatives and an initial screening which will be conducted based on:

- technical feasibility and reliability;
- environmental and public health considerations;
- institutional consideration; and
- cost.

It is anticipated that the ten to twelve alternatives identified in Section 2 will be reduced to five or six alternatives that will be carried into the next step of the process.

Section 4. Detailed Analysis of Alternatives - The alternatives that survive the screening process in Section 3 will be evaluated in more detail based on the following criteria:

- overall protection of human health and the environment;
- compliance with ARARs;
- short-term effectiveness;
- long-term effectiveness;
- reduction of toxicity, mobility or volume;
- implementability;
- cost;
- State acceptance; and
- community acceptance.

Section 5. Comparison of Alternatives - This section will consist of a comparison of the alternatives based on the criteria evaluated in Section 4. It will essentially evaluate and rank the alternatives relative to one another based on the above criteria.

Sections 2 through 5, described above, correspond with the technical memorandums that are required for the Feasibility Study. Each technical memorandum will be submitted in the format of a chapter for the Feasibility Study Report. Therefore, with the completion of the technical memorandum for

comparison of alternatives, the Feasibility Study Report will be complete. Generation of the Draft Feasibility Study Report will consist of writing Chapter 1, the Introduction, and adding the four technical memoranda.

As we discussed in the meeting, Warzyn will provide the technical memoranda for review by U.S. EPA. We will incorporate U.S. EPA and IDEM comments in the Draft Feasibility Study Report. We will not provide separate responses to comments on each of the technical memoranda prior to submittal of the Draft Feasibility Study Report.

We appreciate your responsiveness in meeting with us on November 29, 1990 to provide your cursory review of this Technical Memorandum. We look forward to working with you in the next few months as we continue development of the Feasibility Study Report. If you have any questions please give me a call at (708) 691-5020.

Sincerely,

WARZYN ENGINEERING INC.

Joseph D. Adams Jr. per MSR

Joseph D. Adams Jr., P.E.
Vice President